



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: A.F. Istvan Attorney Docket No.: DIGE126972
Application No.: 09/919,605 Art Unit: 2157 / Confirmation No: 3132
Filed: July 30, 2001 Examiner: R.M. Osman
Title: COORDINATION OF FAVORITES AMONG DISPARATE DEVICES IN
AN INTERACTIVE VIDEO CASTING SYSTEM

RESPONSE TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Seattle, Washington 98101

March 16, 2006

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

A. Response Transmittal

Transmitted herewith is a response to an Office Action in the above-identified application. No additional claim fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}

Kevan L. Morgan
Registration No. 42,015
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1712

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date: 3/16/06
KLM:sdd

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: A.F. Istvan Attorney Docket No.: DIGE126972
Application No.: 09/919,605 Art Unit: 2157 / Confirmation No: 3132
Filed: July 30, 2001 Examiner: R.M. Osman

Title: COORDINATION OF FAVORITES AMONG DISPARATE DEVICES IN
AN INTERACTIVE VIDEO CASTING SYSTEM

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Seattle, Washington 98101

March 16, 2006

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed December 16, 2005. In the Office Action, Claims 1-33, 38, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cragun (U.S. Patent No. 6,557,028). Claims 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cragun in view of Ellis (U.S. Patent No. 6,898,762).

Applicant has carefully considered the pending claims, the cited references, and the comments presented in the Office Action, and respectfully traverses the claim rejections set forth in the Office Action. Neither Cragun alone nor the combination of Cragun and Ellis teaches or suggests each and every element recited in Claims 1-39. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, and for the reasons set forth below, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of this application.

Before discussing in detail the reasons why Claims 1-39 are allowable, applicant provides the following discussion of embodiments described in the present application. This discussion of embodiments is provided, not to define the scope of the claims, but to help the United States Patent and Trademark Office better appreciate aspects of the invention discussed thereafter.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

